

WALL STREET NEWS

Market Less Cheerful Toward
End of Week.

EARLY ADVANCES ARE LOST

It Must Be Admitted That General Business of the Country Shows a Shading Off—Dry Goods Trade in a Demoralized State as Result of High Prices and Fluctuations.

New York, April 10.—The financial situation in Wall street was more cheerfully inclined in the forepart of last week than it was in the latter part.

In the earlier period a more or less decided reaction was visible from the pessimism that in the main prevailed throughout the week preceding. All observers of markets know that the financial community—or, at least, the speculative financial community—becomes tired of gloominess after a short time.

After prices have declined considerably on forebodings of evil, but with evil still actually unrealized, and the expected shock, at any rate, delayed, the natural sanguine American spirit usually asserts itself, speculators begin to declare themselves impressed with the underlying strength of the market, and the discovery is made not infrequently that the market itself is a good deal oversold.

Then a rally takes place, and if the situation has much blacker colors than is warranted, the upward movement may induce a fairly large amount of buying of securities for investment and take on the character of a sustained advance.

Early Advance Lost.
If, however, the result proves that the rise only represents a buying-in of stocks sold speculatively for the decline, and that investment buying is not coming into the market, a survey of conditions then usually brings once more into prominence the unfavorable features of the situation to which attention was previously paid. Whether or not there was an application of these well-known principles last week, the fact is that the security market, after being strong in the first three days of the week, declined sharply afterward and more than lost its early advance.

It has to be admitted in all fairness, that there are also signs that general business over the country is shading off somewhat. The dry goods trade continues in a state of demoralization, as the result of the high prices and rapid fluctuations in the prices of cotton, and financial losses that have been occasioned in the trade are giving rise to serious discussion.

Declining Movement Seen.

In the iron and steel lines the leading trade journals unite in the statement that the declining movement in pig iron does not yet seem to have touched bottom, and that the irregularity in the trade has now extended to finished material, where, although mills dealing with certain products are actively employed, other producing establishments, notably those turning out structural steel and various zinc products, now find themselves with an excess of capacity. At the same time, taken in the aggregate, business conditions can in no way be described as other than prosperous.

Bank clearings and the like certainly do not make poor comparisons with those of previous years, and although this favorable statement cannot include the record failure for the first quarter of the year, the fact is that the large number of business troubles shown in the period was mostly due to troubles in Wall street and among various brokerage concerns.

Among the railway reports quite large increases in gross earnings are still the rule, offset in some prominent instances by such heavily increased expenses as to result in either small increases in net or small net decreases.

DAILY COURT RECORD.

(Saturday, April 9, 1910.)

DISTRICT COURTS.

Court of Appeals.

Remittitur call:
No. 263, Fletcher vs. Alston. Attorneys, Burke & Hays—Fisher.
No. 262, Morris, ex. vs. Metropolitan Surety Company. Attorneys, Darlington.
No. 261, King et al. vs. Shelton. Attorneys, Mosley & Darlington.
No. 260, Sunman vs. Philadelphia. Attorneys, Brown & Korman.
No. 259, Korman vs. Flannery & Hitz.
No. 258, Warner vs. Baker. Attorneys, Darlington—Dale & Hogan.
No. 257, National City Bank vs. Windolph. Attorneys, Ralston—Gardner.
No. 256, Troskowsky et al. vs. Smith Company. Attorneys, Wilson—Ralston.
Special calendar:
No. 11, District of Columbia vs. Coburn. Attorneys, Thomas—Johnson.

Equity Court No. 1.

JUSTICE ANDERSON.

Assignments for April 11:
No. 129, Williamson vs. Williamson. Attorneys, Barnard—Emig & Hays.
No. 205, Herring vs. Becker. Attorneys, Lester & Priebe.
No. 206, Durfee vs. Durfee. Attorneys, Fowler & Baldrige—Tobler.
No. 207, Landale vs. Sterrett. Attorneys, Lester & Priebe—Gittings & Chamberlain.
No. 208, Dill vs. Smith. Attorneys, O'Donoghue—Archer, Smith, Gies & Brandenburg.
There will be no motions heard in Equity Court No. 1 to-day.

Equity Court No. 2.

JUSTICE BARNARD.

No. 2013, Clagett vs. Clagett; divorce a vinculo.
No. 2012, Rose vs. Rose; order substituting examiner. Attorneys, Archer & Smith—M. A. Hestmiller.

Circuit Court No. 1.

JUSTICE WRIGHT.

No. 2555, Wheeler vs. al.; summons to plaintiff's first and second replication of defendant's third and fourth pleas overruled as to paragraphs A and sustained as to paragraph B. Attorneys, Leon Tobner—J. I. Peyer.

Assignments for April 11:
No. 449, McKinnon et al. vs. Horton, Jr. Attorneys, Ambrose—Poe.
No. 479, Egan vs. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. Attorneys, Lambert & Yeaman—Hamilton.
No. 480, Newman vs. Newman et al. Attorneys, Ridout & Gorman—Feyson.
No. 481, Homans vs. Potomac Electric Power Company. Attorneys, Collins & Peyton—Darlington.
No. 482, McKenna vs. Chase. Attorneys, Mather—Davis.
No. 483, Sprow vs. Staples. Attorneys, Jackson, Nicol & Johnson—Syme & Woodard.

Circuit Court No. 2.

CHIEF JUSTICE CLAIBORNE.

Assignments for April 11:
No. 256, Wells vs. Capital Traction Company. Attorneys, Richardson—Perr & Bond and Dunlop.
No. 257, Harrison et al. vs. Wolf. Attorneys, Strassburger—Jeffords & Englehart.
No. 258, Lyon vs. Dancy. Attorneys, Ridout—White.

Criminal Court No. 1.

JUSTICE GOULD.

Assignments for April 11:
United States vs. William Hart and Robert Stern. United States vs. Herbert Riley.
United States vs. Mattie Durall.

Criminal Court No. 2.

JUSTICE STAFFORD.

Assignment for April 11:
No. 485, In re Woodbury B. Ormsby. Attorneys, Johnson—Thompson.

VIEWS OF PEOPLE ON MANY TOPICS

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT IT?

Wilson a Socialist.

Editor The Washington Herald:

The Springfield Republican gets off this: "HE DOESN'T KNOW IT, BUT HE IS."

The cook book of the United States Department of Agriculture is out, and its pages reveal how far the functions of the Federal government are being extended. Secretary Wilson maintains that he is in business to show the people of the United States what are the cheapest and most economical "outs," and to instruct them in the intricacies of making a new dish out of what may be left of the breakfast table. "Uncle Jimmy" is blissfully unaware of the fact, but he has become, in practice, the greatest living Socialist.

Yes; all these attempts on the part of public men to introduce the public to helps in life that they can well enough secure for themselves, if they want them, are socialism. But Secretary James Wilson is by no means the greatest living Socialist. Roosevelt is far ahead of him. Victor L. Berger, the great national Socialist of Milwaukee, has long since acknowledged Roosevelt's genius to the cause.

But United States Senator Charles Dick, of Akron, Ohio, announces that it is time for the Republican party to fight Socialism, and that it is also time for all conservative Democrats to join in the fight. Correct he is. But let him see the fraternalism displayed by the Republicans, as a party and as individuals, and call for its stoppage ere the fight begins. No enemy can be conquered while fed and sustained by the opposing side.

The public schools are the great leaders of Socialism. In Senator Dick prepared to denounce them and call for their abolition? If not, vain is all his effort. The Socialists acknowledge that where education is free everything else should be, and it seems as if food, clothing, medical attendance, and other things are fast coming to the public through the public schools; the city where these things have most been in evidence has now come under Socialistic rule. That city is Milwaukee. Keep it up, and all cities will go the same way.

Time, indeed, to fight Socialism! FRANCIS B. LIVESSEY.

Anti-compulsory Vaccination.

Editor The Washington Herald:

The objects of the Anti-compulsory Vaccination Society of the District of Columbia are, first, to educate the people regarding the right to refuse vaccination, and second, to have a bill introduced in Congress for the repeal of compulsory vaccination within the District.

Vaccination is the only medical prescription which requires State endorsement and compulsory laws. All other medical practices and surgical operations can stand on their own merits.

The highest legal authority—Blackstone—says: "No laws are binding on the human subject which assault the body or violate the conscience."

Compulsory vaccination does both of these for many people. We demand a square deal and liberty of conscience for those who do not care to rest in a fool's paradise by having their life blood defiled to "protect" (?) them from a disease not one in 10,000 will ever get anyway. The millions of people who live in our many States where such outrages on nature are not tolerated by State statutes are not dying off from the bugaboo—smallpox! No city kept in a sanitary condition, and without vaccination, has ever been scourged with smallpox, and no city, however well "vaccinated," but which neglected sanitation, has ever been in the path of a smallpox epidemic without suffering heavily from its condition.

The fact that no "health" officer will dare appear to defend this villainy goes to prove that this infamous scandal is indefensible. If it had any scientific basis, it would be an easy matter to appear in public and explain it to an audience of intelligent people.

The anti-vaccinationists are not ashamed of their position, and they can explain it very clearly.

Vaccination is founded on lunacy, defended by lies, and results in lockjaw. There are four medical schools in Washington, and I challenge any member of the faculty of any one of them to appear in public before me and defend vaccination. If they cannot do this, they are then teaching falsity instead of the truth. Who will appear to try it? Come early to avoid the rush!

Dr. Lesser, of Bonn, Germany, says: "A great number of children fall ill every year of scrofula and consumption, who without vaccination most probably would have remained healthy all their lives." Dr. (Prof.) Krauscheid, of Berlin, says: "I, too, vaccinated my children at a time when I did not know how injurious it was. To-day I would resist if necessary the authorities and the police law." ("Vaccination a Curse.")

I have said for a long time that doctors who vaccinate don't know what they are doing. Now let us see one come out who thinks he does know. It is high time our legislators took some regard of the people's rights. The State should be the friend and protector of its citizens, and not back up this loathsome villainy, instituted by a set of disease manufacturers and disease grafters. It is a lasting shame and outrage that American citizens have to get together, spend their hard earned cash in fighting State enforced disease, which is spreading consumption and cancer in the rising generation. It is a travesty on the word freedom to use it in connection with a State or country in which such laws are tolerated on the statute books for a single day.

The law is a form of class legislation of the most cowardly kind. Compulsory disease is not conducive to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," as guaranteed by our Constitution. The fact that such a fool law exists shows to what extent our legislators have been debauched by vaccine grafters.

Parents who have their children slaughtered by this "murderous humbug" have no redress whatever. The doctor trusts supports all its members, except those who come out against the lucrative blood poisoning business. Political doctors have many loop holes to support the cowpox ring and keep it from reproach at all hazards.

Parents little know the insidious character of the loathsome vaccine poison. The great Herbert Spencer said: "The assumption that vaccination changes the constitution in relation to smallpox and does not otherwise change it is sheer folly."

Sir William J. Collins, M. D. M. P., said: "Consumption, scrofula, and other blood diseases were comparatively unknown before smallpox was introduced."

What amount of brain have the members of the medical profession, who imagine we can get freedom from diseases when they are putting the concentration

of loathsome disease into the very life blood of the rising generation every few years? Some doctors say that the vile poison in vaccine virus is the cause of the rapid decay of the teeth of public school children, enlarged tonsils, and other throat affections, as well as eczema and suppurative diseases. Public school children are in no more danger of contracting smallpox than Sunday school, private school, or Catholic school children, upon whom this "graft that kills" is not worked to a finish.

The time has come to free American citizens from this infamy. Let those who want "protection" (?) from disease, by introducing a worse one, have all they want, but don't let the State laws make a fool of everybody!

Yours for the rights guaranteed by our Constitution, and for pure and red American blood, unpolluted by the imported pox of the cow. HARRY B. BRADFORD.

Republicanism.

Editor The Washington Herald:

The hue and cry of the disciples of Republicanism throughout the country prior to the Congressional election is party loyalty, party adherence, and party regularity. Republican victories can only be achieved in the near future by the distribution of patronage to Republican workers and supporters; by adherence to party platform pledges, and by party regularity in the organization of the rank and file. There is not the least doubt that the Republican party is rapidly departing from Republicanism as comprehension by Lincoln and Grant, and it is not speculative to say that it has substituted commercialism for Republicanism, and that, in innumerable instances, it has rewarded Democratic insurgents, who are no more nor less than political traitors, with positions of honor and trust that Republican regulars are entitled to.

The leaders of the Republican party are screaming, as they did in the last campaign, for the rank and file to get together and save the party from a probably disastrous defeat in the Congressional election. If the party is saved, immediately thereafter the beneficiaries will begin to scour the country for what they have designated as inexperienced, incompetent, and nonprogressive Democrats for Federal judgeships, Cabinet offices, and thousands of other positions that should be given to Republican stalwarts. The spectacle of appointing Democrats to these positions, when there are so many competent, experienced, and progressive Republicans, should be denounced by the Republican rank and file, as well as by many of the party leaders.

The commission of political treason by the leaders of the party engenders political treason in the rank and file of the party.

The attempt to build up the Republican party in the South and the sections of the country by appointing Democratic deserters to official positions that loyal Republicans should receive, is the grossest disloyalty and ingratitude to the men who have fought the battles of the party, at the sacrifice of money, labor, time, and friends. Apparently, there is a desire among men high up in the councils of the Republican party to break up the Democratic party by the distribution of Federal patronage to Democrats, instead of expending it to worthy and deserving Republicans, but that they will never be able to accomplish. The dissolution of one party will mean the dissolution of the other. The vitality of one party is as essential to the vitality of the other as the vitality of the animal kingdom is essential to the vitality of the vegetable kingdom and vice versa. Without competition in the electorate, either party, if in power, would be the victim of internal strife and factional disturbances of such a nature that its existence as a party would be short-lived. If dissensions in the Republican party occur, they should be adjusted within the party without the advice of Democratic recruits, who have done all in their power to defeat the Republican party since its birth, and who, in their days of strenuous political activity, were undesirable in the Democratic party.

The workers who constitute the machinery of the Republican party, whenever they apply to one of the party chiefs for positions or promotions, are admonished that they should be Republicans for principle and not for office, when the very existence of the party depends upon the party workers. Every sane man knows that every Republican cannot be appointed to a government position, and every sane man is well aware that every Republican is not seeking a government position; but, when there are vacancies to be filled, Republicans should be given the preference, or the organization or individuals endorsing them should know the reason why. The Republicans in every section of this country should muster up

the courage and be men enough to say, in no uncertain way, that they demand at least the Federal patronage under Republican administrations, or they will continue to fight within the party until leaders are placed at the head of affairs who will recognize worthy and meritorious Republicans. The Republicans in every section of this country, should hold meetings and pass resolutions requesting the President of the United States, the greatest beneficiary and leader of the Republican party, to ask for the resignation of Secretary MacVegh, of the Treasury Department; Secretary Dickinson, of the War Department; and appoint as their successors loyal and patriotic Republicans. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of Republicans who voice the sentiment that to the victors belong the spoils.

H. A. CLARKE.

Eternal Punishment.

Editor The Washington Herald:

In your issue of Monday, March 28, I noticed a communication from a Mr. Elliot M. Thomson, who assumes to champion Mr. Russell, and to correct me, without, however, refuting the Scripture texts I gave upon eternal punishment, advertising at the same time, without cost, some of Mr. Russell's literature.

It is the way of some men, first, to laugh to scorn those who present unanswerable truth. He begins by saying, "I am amused." He then credits Mr. Russell with bringing "to light long-hidden truth." If Mr. Russell can present some minor phases of truth, he is not to be credited with what others have done long before his literature had any public existence. I have been acquainted with some of his publications since 1880.

But we are informed by Mr. Thomson that "the horrible and defiling doctrine of eternal torment is removed" by Mr. Russell from the Bible. I would again remind your readers that the words "eternal" and the equivalent for "eternal," in the words "forever and ever," are still in the Bible, and put there under the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

It is said of those who will yet follow and do homage to that "wicked" one, who is yet to come, that they "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name" (Rev. xiv. 9, 10). I quote this, to expound it, but to show that the Holy Spirit, through the Apostle John, under the authority of Christ, placed those words just where they are found; and if Mr. Russell has "removed" them, and from the book which has an exceedingly solemn warning uttered against any one who would dare to attempt it, will he not incur the penalty?

I quote again: "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book" (Rev. xxi. 19). I again repeat that I have proof that Mr. Russell denies the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ. Mr. Thomson's quotation from Mr. Russell's interpretation notwithstanding. Mr. Thomson is pleased to call this word "mystic," I gather, with the view of giving it some other meaning. But it is the exact word used by the Holy Spirit, and needs no substitution or apologetic definition by Mr. Russell or Mr. Thomson. Error can never be frank, but evasive. Scriptural terms and words are too plain for his play, and a better from Mr. Frohman telling her that "she is the author's choice to act in English the title role of his 'Chanteclair.'"

"This is simply grand," she exclaimed. All of which is quite different from the recently called, spiteful announcement when told that Mr. Frohman had deplayed \$20,000 for the English rights of the play: "Who is Charles Frohman?" It is now apparent that this was utterly gratuitous as well as discourteous. Roscoe did not know Mr. Frohman, but also Miss Adams, who appeared in his L'Aiglon ten years ago.

But why Miss Adams is to act the male role, which even tried the robust physical powers of Guttry, instead of the charming pheasant, in which Miss Simone won golden laurels, is a mystery. And the inquiry is natural, who will impersonate the pheasant, if not Miss Adams?

MAUDE ADAMS DELIGHTED.

In "Chanteclair" She Has Her Second Rostand Part.

Among the most astonishing news of the day is the announcement that Maude Adams will not appear as the seductive Hen Pheasant in Rostand's "Chanteclair," with which Mr. Frohman has endowed her, but in Guttry's part, the title role—Chanteclair himself. It is said that first filled the eyes of the actress when, out in Chicago, she met her manager's messenger, tore the wrapper off the package which he handed her, found it to contain Rostand's own copy of his play, and a letter from Mr. Frohman telling her that "she is the author's choice to act in English the title role of his 'Chanteclair.'"

"This is simply grand," she exclaimed. All of which is quite different from the recently called, spiteful announcement when told that Mr. Frohman had deplayed \$20,000 for the English rights of the play: "Who is Charles Frohman?" It is now apparent that this was utterly gratuitous as well as discourteous. Roscoe did not know Mr. Frohman, but also Miss Adams, who appeared in his L'Aiglon ten years ago.

But why Miss Adams is to act the male role, which even tried the robust physical powers of Guttry, instead of the charming pheasant, in which Miss Simone won golden laurels, is a mystery. And the inquiry is natural, who will impersonate the pheasant, if not Miss Adams?

William Bonelli.

William Bonelli, who gives the pleasing hypnotic skill in Ziegfeld's "Follies of 1909," which opens at the National to-night, is an American by naturalization, as he was born in London thirty-five years ago. He received his education at the Columbia College, was half back on the football eleven at the age of seventeen, and had the reputation of being the strongest freshman in college. He studied law, but his love for sports kept him from his studies and he failed in his examinations.

He always was a clever elocutionist, and at the Lotus Club Sir Henry Irving heard him recite, and offered him a position in his company, which was accepted at once. After a year's training with Sir Henry, he starred as a "boy tragedian," and played "Hamlet" when he was eighteen. He has been in the support of Denman Thompson, Annie Russell, Virginia Harned, Minnie Seligman, Julia Arthur, Nance O'Neill, and other players. During the season of "Men and Women" he played the juvenile part when Rose Stahl was a member of the cast. He was never introduced to her, and her first lines spoken to him were, "Will, I love you." A short time after the premiere of "Men and Women" they were married. They then went starring in "Janice Meredith."

Miss Stahl left for London to see to "The Chorus Lady," and Bonelli joined Mary Manning. He made his debut in

LOAN SOCIETIES.

ON DIAMONDS, WATCHES, JEWELRY, &c.

A Philanthropic Institution.

CAPITAL \$100,000.

Reference—Any financial institution.

Redemptions made from pawnbrokers and new loans issued on security of reduced saving to the borrower.

PRUDENTIAL LOAN SOCIETY.

Ground floor, N. W. Cor. 12th and G. sts.

Private side entrance. Transactions strictly confidential.

THE THEATRE TO-DAY

THE BELASCO.

"The Midnight Sons," At 8:30.

Low Fields' big review, with a cast including George W. Moore, Harry Fisher, James Spottwood, George Schiller, Maude Lambert, and Clara Palmer.

THE NEW NATIONAL.

"The Follies of 1909," At 8:30.

Return engagement of the successful Ziegfeld review. A half-dozen frolics.

THE COLUMBIA.

"Bobby Burdell," At 8:15.

Wallace Edinger, in a dramatization of the story by George Randolph Chester, entitled "The Making of Bobby Burdell."

CHASERS.

At 8:15 and 8:45.

Al Jolson, late with the Dagobert's Minstrels, and seven other splendid acts.

THE ACADEMY.

"The Lion and the Mouse," At 8:15.

Charles Klein's modern drama for the first time at popular prices.

THE CASINO.

Continuous Vaudeville. From 11:30 a. m. to 11 p. m.

Haslam, the man without lenses, leads a good programme of vaudeville novelties.

THE GAYETY.

Burlesque. At 8:15 and 8:45.

THE LACEHOL.

Burlesque. At 8:15 and 8:45.

A PLUCKY KID.

At Jolson, the Author and the Urcin.

Al Jolson, Chase's headliner this week, was playing both the Victoria and The Bronx in New York City last week. Every afternoon and evening an auto drew up on the Forty-second street side of the Victoria. Mr. Jolson, made up complete in blackface, with a straw hat and minstrel suit, emerged and took it on the run for the auto. The machine then swirled away and came near fracturing the speed record in getting him safely to the far north.

One day, wishing to give his chauffeur a bit of diversion, Al took him behind the scenes when he first reached the Victoria. To guard the auto during his absence, Mr. Jolson then enlisted a stocky, freckled, red-topped kid of about fifteen, promising him largest for good guardship and telling him to be vigilant against possible motor thieves. The show went on. The boy stuck to his post like a bulldog watching his master's clothes, and all was peaceful as a summer's dream.

Presently Mr. Jolson, black-faced, straw-hatted, emerged and ran across the sidewalk. He opened the door of the machine and started to climb in.

"Git outa this!" said the faithful boy. "Wotcher think I am? Think I'm goin' to let any con in here?"

"But, my boy," cried Mr. Jolson, excitedly and ungrammatically, "it's me, myself."

"I don't care who you are," said the boy. "I wouldn't let Jack Johnson into this machine, git outa this!"

Mr. Jolson continued to advance, and the boy coolly and composedly sighted for the end of his nose—and hit it. Then he swung right and left upon his jaw, and wound up by yelling for a cop. With great difficulty, the fighting kid was overpowered, and it was still more difficult to make him believe that the damaged "black" man was his employer.

Mr. Jolson, though, can see a joke, and the boy got an extra tip.

MAUDE ADAMS DELIGHTED.

In "Chanteclair" She Has Her Second Rostand Part.

Among the most astonishing news of the day is the announcement that Maude Adams will not appear as the seductive Hen Pheasant in Rostand's "Chanteclair," with which Mr. Frohman has endowed her, but in Guttry's part, the title role—Chanteclair himself. It is said that first filled the eyes of the actress when, out in Chicago, she met her manager's messenger, tore the wrapper off the package which he handed her, found it to contain Rostand's own copy of his play, and a letter from Mr. Frohman telling her that "she is the author's choice to act in English the title role of his 'Chanteclair.'"

"This is simply grand," she exclaimed. All of which is quite different from the recently called, spiteful announcement when told that Mr. Frohman had deplayed \$20,000 for the English rights of the play: "Who is Charles Frohman?" It is now apparent that this was utterly gratuitous as well as discourteous. Roscoe did not know Mr. Frohman, but also Miss Adams, who appeared in his L'Aiglon ten years ago.

But why Miss Adams is to act the male role, which even tried the robust physical powers of Guttry, instead of the charming pheasant, in which Miss Simone won golden laurels, is a mystery. And the inquiry is natural, who will impersonate the pheasant, if not Miss Adams?

William Bonelli.

William Bonelli, who gives the pleasing hypnotic skill in Ziegfeld's "Follies of 1909," which opens at the National to-night, is an American by naturalization, as he was born in London thirty-five years ago. He received his education at the Columbia College, was half back on the football eleven at the age of seventeen, and had the reputation of being the strongest freshman in college. He studied law, but his love for sports kept him from his studies and he failed in his examinations.

He always was a clever elocutionist, and at the Lotus Club Sir Henry Irving heard him recite, and offered him a position in his company, which was accepted at once. After a year's training with Sir Henry, he starred as a "boy tragedian," and played "Hamlet" when he was eighteen. He has been in the support of Denman Thompson, Annie Russell, Virginia Harned, Minnie Seligman, Julia Arthur, Nance O'Neill, and other players. During the season of "Men and Women" he played the juvenile part when Rose Stahl was a member of the cast. He was never introduced to her, and her first lines spoken to him were, "Will, I love you." A short time after the premiere of "Men and Women" they were married. They then went starring in "Janice Meredith."

Miss Stahl left for London to see to "The Chorus Lady," and Bonelli joined Mary Manning. He made his debut in

LOAN SOCIETIES.

ON DIAMONDS, WATCHES, JEWELRY, &c.

A Philanthropic Institution.

CAPITAL \$100,000.

Reference—Any financial institution.

Redemptions made from pawnbrokers and new loans issued on security of reduced saving to the borrower.

PRUDENTIAL LOAN SOCIETY.